DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 146 TM 013 730

AUTHOR Sutton, James H.
TITLE Evaluation: A Primer for Teachers.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 28p.; Paper draws heavily on the National Education Association's "School Personnel Evaluation Manual."
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Collegiality; *Educational Assessment; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Formative Evaluation; Personnel Evaluation; Self Evaluation (Groups); *Summative Evaluation; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Improvement; Teacher Rights; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS External Evaluation; Iowa

ABSTRACT

As schools move from corporate to collegial forms of organization, it will become necessary to adapt evaluation systems to collegial environments. This paper outlines a system that utilizes features of professional self-regulation from higher education while maintaining dispute resolution mechanisms from the public sector. Features of the system are: (1) definition of summative evaluation as "potentially punitive" and formative evaluation as "non-punitive" and related to normal career development; (2) separation of formative and summative evaluation into distinct (non-overlapping) mechanisms; (3) confidentiality of formative evaluation data; (4) involvement of teachers in formative, but not summative, evaluation; (5) use of outside evaluation teams in cases of alleged deficiency of tenured teachers; (6) review by outside evaluators who include teachers; (7) recognizing evaluation as one element in a comprehensive effort to transform schools into collegial environments; and (8) delegation of the responsibility for initiating summative evaluation to central administration and formative evaluation to principals. Recommendations for adapting the approach to educational reform legislation in Iowa and to Iowa's collective bargaining law are included. A sample procedure is given for evaluation in a self-regulated school. Also included is an enumeration of the professional rights of teachers, characteristics of an unfair evaluation; and the linking of group evaluation to achievement of group goals for purposes of performance-based compensation. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED310146

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JAMES H. SUTTON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EVALUATION: A PRIMER FOR TEACHERS

by Dr. James H. Sutton
Administrative Lobbyist

THE IOWA STATE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

1989

TM013730

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.

2. General Philosophy

3. General Principles of Evaluation.

4. Unfair Evaluation.

5. Evaluation and Professional Rights.

6. Sample Evaluation Procedures.

7. Relationship to Phase III.

8. Alternative to Individual Evaluation Model.

9. Evaluation of Phase III Plans.

10. Evaluation of Teachers in Phase III Plans.

    9.1. "Pure" Performance-based Plans.
    9.2 Composite Plans.

11. Recommendations for Evaluation in Phase III.

NOTE: This Primer draws heavily on the NEA's "School Personnel Evaluation Manual." Please refer to this manual for further information.

In making a distinction between potentially punitive and non-punitive evaluation, this primer used the terms "summative" and "formative" in ways which differ from standard usage in research literature or current practice.

EVALUATION

1. Introduction.

As schools attempt to move from corporate to collegial forms of organization, those who represent teachers will be obliged to adapt evaluation systems to collegial environments. These innovations will borrow aspects of evaluation from higher education while maintaining features of present systems. This paper outlines a system which utilizes features of professional self-regulation from higher education while maintaining dispute resolution mechanisms from the public sector. Its features are (1) definition of "summative" as "potentially punitive" and "formative" as "non-punitive" which is related to "normal career growth;" (2) Separation of formative and summative evaluation into distinct mechanisms which do not overlap; (3) Confidentiality of formative evaluation data; (4) Involvement of teachers in formative evaluation, but not summative evaluation; (5) Outside evaluating teams as factfinders in cases of alleged deficiency of tenured teachers; (6) De novo review by outside evaluating teams which include teachers; (7) Viewing evaluation as one element in a comprehensive effort to transform schools into collegial environments; and (8) Delegation of responsibility for initiating summative evaluation to central administration and formative to principals. Included are recommendations for adapting the approach to Iowa's reform legislation ("Phase III") and its collective bargaining law, where both criteria and procedures of evaluation are mandatory subjects of collective

bargaining. A sample procedure is provided, as well as an enumeration of professional rights; characteristics of unfair evaluation; and the linking of group evaluation to achievement of group goals for purposes of performance-based compensation. The approach should be useful in districts which bargain and which are committed to creating collegial schools along the lines recommended by the Carnegie Report, "A Nation Prepared."

2. General Philosophy

The purpose of evaluation is to improve professional performance. When the performance of an educator is presumed to be within the parameters of normal career growth, evaluation is "non-punitive" or "informal." When performance is presumed to be deficient, evaluation is called "formal" or "punitive," since it implies sanctions.

Both forms of evaluation have their place. Informal evaluation helps teachers improve competencies and supports normal career growth. Punitive evaluation protects teachers (and students) from the consequences of unacceptable performance in colleagues.

But evaluation is legitimate under certain conditions only. Formative evaluation -- improving performance to promote normal career growth -- is viable only within an effective, planned and financed professional development program for all educators. Normal professional growth for teachers or administrators cannot be achieved if support for growth is absent.

To be legitimate, formal evaluation must protect the rights of the individual. It can do this by providing an opportunity for notification of deficiency; opportunity for reply; multiple evaluation to establish deficiency; remediation; support such as released time; and re-evaluation. It must also protect the rights of the profession. It can do this by providing facts; substantive and procedural due process; and guarantees of academic freedom and other professional rights.

Where evaluation is moral, legal and professional, the ISEA supports it. In part, this is because every profession supports high standards of performance. But teaching has a special problem: While it is recognized as a profession, it does not enjoy the prerogatives, rights or status of a profession.

One purpose of the ISEA is to create a fully recognized profession where none presently exists. This can be done by empowering teachers to take responsibility for the learning environment at the building level based on the latest professional research and with sufficient support to accomplish the task. But achieving this objective implies the transformation of schools from corporate to collegial learning environments. Such a transformation requires change in the elements which comprise the learning environment at the building level. One such element is teachers' autonomy. Some other elements are professional development, minimum salary levels, supplemental pay and performance-based pay, as Phase III legislation recognizes. Evaluation is also one of the elements.

A professional evaluation system assumes that a teachers' association and its school district have agreed to a program of comprehensive school change whose purpose is the transformation of school buildings from corporate to collegial learning environments. Where commitment has been made to transform the systems within a school building, this material will be useful in helping to transform the evaluation system in conjunction with the other essential systems. However, unless all systems are undergoing transformation, the adoption of a profession-based evaluation system within a corporate school will cause serious disruptions and problems. This is because present systems in a corporate school are highly adapted to corporate schools. Although the discussion of evaluation which follows here may be useful in many contexts, its application as a system is intended only for districts which have made a commitment to transform schools from corporate to collegial learning environments.

3. General Principles of Evaluation.

Evaluation is a complex subject requiring study. The material here is intended as a brief review of key points. As a general matter, teacher evaluation should:

* Be part of a comprehensive program of school improvement leading to the transformation of schools from corporate to collegial environments.
* Be one of many elements of school change applied as part of a systems approach.

* Be part of a long-range district plan for professional development of teachers and administrators.

* Provide praise and useful feedback for normal career growth.

* Provide teachers needing intervention assistance with diagnosis, assistance and support.

* Promote retention of the developing and experienced teacher.

* Guarantee professional rights and the rights of the individual.

* Balance subjective observations with objective judgments.

* Be specific.

* Use job targets and career objectives as well as checklists.

* Insure that important factors have greater weight than less important factors.

* Have teachers weigh checklist criteria to establish importance.

* Distinguish among the needs of the beginning teacher, the developing teacher and the accomplished teacher.

* Make use of recent research about good teaching or evaluation.

* Give principals time for evaluation.

* Insure that principals are trained to evaluate collegially.

* Relieve principals from the responsibility of initiating punitive evaluation so that the process of normal evaluation will be open and credible.

* Separate punitive (summative) evaluation from developmental (formative) assessment to optimize normal career growth.

* Communicate evaluation in a timely fashion and in a form which is useful to the teacher.

* Identify which instruments and methods should be used; the frequency of evaluation; the teacher's role in evaluation; and the use of evaluation in the district activities.

* Establish the goal as optimizing normal career growth based on each teacher's career level -- beginning, developing or accomplished.

* Provide a separate procedure for suspected serious deficiencies.

* In cases of suspected serious deficiency, provide a procedure which provides for separate multiple evaluations by educators from outside of the district; the identification of deficiencies with opportunity for response; the development of a plan for correction of deficiency which includes timelines, resources; re-evaluation at the completion of timelines; and grievability of results.

* Be reliable, valid and utilitarian.

* Use a small number of evaluators who are both trained and familiar with the level and subject-matter of the person being evaluated.

* Use a standard, well-defined reporting process.

* Use multiple observations and consultations with teachers.

* Match the evaluation process to the purpose of the evaluation.

* Document behaviors so that they can be validated by someone other than the original documentor.

* Limit evaluation to the time and resources which are available.

* Limit evaluation to objectives and behaviors which fall within an educator's discretion and range of responsibility.

* Be cost effective.

* Be achieved by agreement of teachers and the district.

* Produce high quality data which is useful in other activities.

* Promote communication and group identity.

* Improve school climate.

* Improve the quality of instruction and student achievement on multiple measures which reflect higher order skills.

Concerning peer evaluation, the following is worth noting:

* Peer ratings based on classroom observations have been held by researchers to be useless when they are used for summative purposes.

* Practical experiments have led to mixed results, from enthusiasm to increased tension among teachers.

* Researchers do not recommend peer review as a basis for personnel decisions because it is not subject to direct administrative control; because there are few reliable procedures for peer review; and because teachers are not prepared or trained for the process.

* Peer evaluation differs from peer assistance. Peer evaluation must not enlist teachers as agents of their own school district in the implementation of formal (summative) evaluation. Peer assistance may enlist teachers as information resources (formative assessors) for other teachers, particularly beginning teachers.

Concerning checklists, the following is worth noting:

* Checklists appear more scientific than they are.

* The selection of items for a checklist can be arbitrary or politically motivated.

* Effective teaching behaviors vary with prior student achievement, grade level, socio-economic background, the weather and even the proximity of a holiday.

* Student outcomes are cumulative and not all learning is formal. It is difficult to isolate the effect of any one teacher on student performance.

* The range of acceptable behaviors and their combinations are great. No researcher has found any single behavior which is characteristic of effective teaching in all contexts.

* Quality is not a matter of quantity. It may be logically impossible to evaluate affective teaching behaviors by means of cognitive measures.

In Iowa the following also applies:

* Evaluation is a mandatory subject of bargaining. Districts may not unilaterally impose <u>criteria</u> or <u>procedures</u> of evaluation before negotiating them.

* Since evaluation is a mandatory subject of bargaining, teacher evaluation which is part of a Phase III plan must be negotiated.

* Since peer evaluation is an evaluation procedure, its use must be negotiated.

* After July 1, 1990, any evaluator of a teacher must hold an evaluation endorsement. Teachers may not evaluate other teachers after that date, unless the teacher holds the evaluator endorsement.

* The distribution of questionnaires to teachers by a district on a matter relating to a mandatory subject is a prohibited practice. Only the certified bargaining agent may distribute and collect such questionnaires. In Iowa, both criteria and process of evaluation are mandatory subjects of bargaining.

All districts are at different points in their development, and the range of school cultures is great. For this reason, only you can apply these principles to your school. Many plans are possible. Flexibility and inventiveness will facilitate the development of an evaluation system which is appropriate for your district.

4. Unfair Evaluation.

Evaluation of a teacher or administrator is unfair if:

* It is inaccurate on a material fact.
* It fails to consider material constraints, such as pupil background, overcrowding, availability of school supplies, etc.
* The evaluator is not familiar with recent research on pedagogy and methods.
* The evaluator is unfamiliar with board policy, applicable federal or state law or rules; professional ethics; or standards of current practice.
* The evaluator has no academic preparation or in-service training in effective evaluation.
* The evaluator relied on hearsay.
* The time for practitioner observation was inadequate for making or reaching a valid conclusion.
* The evaluator failed to provide specific recommendations for improvement of performance.
* The evaluator failed to provide progressive evaluation by failing to offer adequate forewarning of deficiency or insufficient time or assistance for remediation or denied any opportunity for remediation.
* The practitioner was being downgraded for duties assigned outside of the practitioner's major area of certification or beyond the contract year or beyond contracted duties.

* The standards applied are vague or so broad as to be meaningless.

* The standards applied are arbitrary, capricious or impossible to attain.

* The standards have not been consistently applied or enforced.

* The practitioner is being downgraded for behavior or standards which are beyond the school's jurisdiction.

* The evaluation violates professional canons of performance or academic freedom, including rights of speech, association and political preference.

* Any portion of the evaluation derives from anonymous comment.

* The evaluation does not consider the responses of the person evaluated.

* A deficiency has been corrected and has not re-occurred.

* The evaluation ignores or underrates strengths in favor of deficiencies.

* Evaluation occurred under conditions of stress or harassment.

* Testing data was used inappropriately or contrary to a test's specifications.

* The district lacks a long-range plan for practitioner professional development as required by state school accreditation standards.

5. Evaluation and Professional Rights.

Evaluation is an attempt to ascertain whether an employee has carried out responsibilities. Responsibilities imply rights. One cannot evaluate a person fairly for a task if the person lacked authority to perform the task. For a teacher, responsibilities imply professional rights. One cannot evaluate a teacher fairly for carrying out professional responsibilities unless the teacher had a right to carry out the responsibility. Accordingly,

there are professional rights which are prerequisite to professional evaluation. Such rights should be part of every contract. Some are identified here.

1. The right to be licensed and practice the profession under ethical and professional standards established, maintained and enforced by the profession through the Iowa Professional Teaching Practices Commission and the Iowa Board of Educational Examiners.

2. The right to maintain and improve one's professional competence.

3. The right to exercise professional judgment in presenting, interpreting and criticizing information and ideas, including controversial ideas, which arise from or are reasonably related to the material which is being taught.

4. The right to participate and influence the formulation of policies and procedures which affect one's professional services in such areas as curriculum, teaching materials, methods of instruction, in-service and professional development, student measurement, the management of the learning environment at the building level through collegial processes, and school-community relations.

5. The right to exercise professional judgment in the use of teaching methods, materials and other devices appropriate to the needs, interests, capabilities, and background of a student.

6. The right to school information about a student for the purpose of providing professional services.

7. The right to work in an atmosphere conducive to learning which provides reasonable means of preserving the learning environment, and the health and safety of those within the environment.

8. The right to exercise academic freedom, including the right to publicly express views on matters affecting education, and the right to exercise the rights of citizenship.

9. The right to attend and address a governing body and be afforded access to its records.

10. The exclusive right to evaluate students or perform such other professional tasks for which the practitioner is licensed.

6. Sample Evaluation Procedures.

The following is a generalized procedure for evaluation in a self-regulated school. It is intended as an example, not as a boilerplate. Each evaluation procedure must be adapted to the unique needs of teachers and districts. UniServ directors are essential in this process and should be consulted whenever changes in evaluation procedures are contemplated.

Evaluation is a formal procedure conducted by a superintendent and educators from outside the employing entity for the purpose of determining whether a potentially punitive claim of professional deficiency against a tenured educator is factual, justified and correct. Assessment is an interaction between an educator and an immediate supervisor for the purpose of identifying job targets for improvement within the parameters of normal career growth.

Evaluation for a tenured teacher may occur at any time by a superintendent, and may be initiated at his or her discretion. Assessment shall be between a teacher and his or her immediate supervisor, and shall occur regularly during the school year. However, teachers holding a probationary certificate shall be assessed at least three times per year; teachers holding the professional certificate shall be assessed once a year; and teachers holding the career certificate shall be assessed once every third year.

If the superintendent believes an educator is not meeting professional standards and wishes to implement an employment-related or contractual sanction against the educator, the superintendent shall implement the following procedure before implementing the sanction:

A. The alleged deficiency of the educator from professional expectations shall be specified and sent to the educator in writing by certified mail. The educator shall have the opportunity to respond in writing within ten days.

B. An evaluation committee consisting of educators who are not employed by the district shall be convened. This committee shall consist of three persons. One shall be an administrator from the same educational level as the educator to be evaluated; one shall be a teacher from the same level and subject matter as the educator to be evaluated; and one shall be a practitioner who shall be a faculty member in a licensed practitioner preparation program in Iowa. A member of the evaluation committee shall not have a prior relationship with a school district, a superintendent or the person who is being evaluated.

C. The evaluation committee shall determine whether the alleged deficiency is factual and valid. It shall collect evidence necessary to make its determination. It shall visit the classroom or professional setting of the person to be evaluated at least three times. At least two of these visits shall be announced with prior notice.

D. If the committee deems that the allegations of deficiency are justified but do not constitute deficiencies which are below the range of acceptable district or professional performance, the evaluation shall be concluded and the superintendent shall take such steps as local procedures provide. If the committee deems that the alleged deficiencies are not justified, the evaluation shall be concluded, the matter shall be expunged from the personnel record of the evaluated educator, and no punitive action shall be taken. If the committee deems that the allegations are justified and that one or more

deficiencies of the person evaluated are below the range of professional or district performance, the committee shall so notify the Iowa Professional Teaching Practices Commission or the district, respectively.

E. The committee or a district's evaluation committee established for the purpose shall establish a plan for the correction of deficiency for the tenured educator whose practices are below the range of district performance. This plan shall identify the specific actions which must be taken for remediation. These may include released time, additional education or other activity which is deemed necessary. The district shall commit such resources as may be necessary to implement the remediation plan. A plan shall not require more than one year for completion.

F. After the term provided by the appropriate committee for the completion of the remediation plan, the committee or its successor shall meet to determine whether the plan has been implemented successfully and whether the educator is performing within the range of acceptable district standards. If the determination is that remediation has been successful, the evaluation process shall cease and no punitive action shall be taken against the educator. If the remediation has not been successful, the committee shall so inform the district, which shall take necessary action. The committee's record shall constitute a finding of fact which shall be admissible in any hearing before the Commission.

G. The procedures in this section shall be applied prior to implementation of Chapter 279 of the Code against a tenured educator when a claim of district deficiency is made, but shall not be employed when a claim of ethical deficiency is made. All terminations in which a claim of ethical deficiency is made shall be reported to the Iowa Professional Teaching Practices Commission for action. The procedures of this section shall also apply to sections to 279.15 through 279.18 of the Code, or to evaluation of a superintendent by a board of directors. Written records, except records relating to assessment, shall be available to the evaluation committee during an evaluation; however, the committee shall evaluate an educator de novo and rely on its own observations to establish sufficiency or deficiency of an educator.

In an assessment, the identification of job targets shall be the mutual responsibility of a teacher and his or her supervisor, and shall reflect their best judgment about the activities most likely to optimize normal career growth for the teacher. The implementation of job targets shall be from the presumption of normal career growth appropriate to the teacher's current or next higher level of accomplishment and certification. The district shall provide support to implement job targets as part of its long-range plan for professional development; as part of Phase III; or as part of such other programs for professional development as may hereinafter come into being. Such support shall include reimbursement of obtaining additional education;

travel to professional conventions; extended contracts; released time to participate in in-service or evaluation in one's own or another district; sabbaticals; exchange programs; etc., to the extent that such support is available to the district.

7. Relationship to Phase III.

Evaluation relates to Phase III in two ways -- as evaluation of teachers in connection with innovative compensation plans and as evaluation of a Phase III plan itself or its components. Because Phase III plans often refer to existing evaluation instruments as a criterion of performance-based pay, teachers should familiarize themselves with evaluation in preparation for their participation in study groups dealing with performance-based pay.

8. Alternative to Individual Evaluation Model.

Many problems with performance-based pay derive from linking it to evaluation of individuals. These problems can be avoided if performance-based pay is linked instead to evaluation of group effort. Under this model, goals are identified for each building or equivalent unit by the professionals at that site. After approval of the goals by an agreed upon process, the goals are implemented. After evaluation of the goals by an agreed upon process, a negotiated amount is awarded to members of the unit for goals achieved. Disagreements must be grievable.

This approach encourages teachers and administrators to work as a team; permits different goals for each site; integrates well with programs for site-based management and professional development; promotes transformation of schools from corporate to professional organizations within a systems approach for change; is consistent with the requirements of Phase III; and eliminates the problems connected with basing differential compensation on individual activities, which are difficult to measure. Also, developmental growth is enhanced and cognitive dissonance is diminished by basing group evaluation on group effort.

9. Evaluation of Phase III Plans.

The Department of Education requires districts and AEA's to specify how their Phase III plans are to be evaluated. Its rules require that:

* The evaluation plan is comprehensive and relates all components of the plan back to the educational needs and Phase III goals identified by the board.
* Evaluation is planned for each component and each plan objective.
* The evaluation plan attempts to measure the impact of superior teacher performance -- or additional work assignment or training -- on increased student performance.

Districts propose to meet these criteria by having the school board and administrators monitor the plan (84%); self reporting (77%); using the Phase

III committee to monitor progress (71%); utilizing data (68%); and utilizing informal surveys (65%). AEA's propose to use monitoring the Phase III committees (93%); self-reporting (87%); monitoring by the administration and/or the board of directors (80%); utilizing informal surveys (47%).

According to the Department of Education, many evaluation proposals lack specificity and depth, and many plans which were submitted required emendation in this area. Despite revisions, the Department believes that evaluation still needs improvement. Two types of evaluation will be needed -- process evaluation and product evaluation. Process evaluation will examine whether a district did what it said it was going to do. Product evaluation will determine the impact of Phase III on students.

Teachers should identify, develop, propose and implement expanded or innovative methods for evaluating Phase III program components and their effect on teachers and students. Teachers should determine the overall objectives of a proposed performance-based pay system; divide the system into its components; determine ways of measuring each component; identify standards; relate proposed evaluation mechanisms against each standard; select the proposal which best measures all component parts and reflects all standards; and recommend the selected evaluation mechanism to the bargaining unit through your local association for negotiation and ratification.

Recommendations should measure the qualitative as well as the quantitative, since higher order skills and behaviors are difficult to quantify. Long-range objectives should not be sacrificed to the desire to demonstrate immediate results. Teachers should be wary of defining "student achievement" narrowly as "good test scores" or linking a teacher's evaluation with standardized tests. Developers of tests warn that these cannot be used to measure individual teacher performance. Reliable, valid, useful tests for summative evaluation are not widely available. There is often a poor match between instructional materials used and the standardized test. The number of students and teaching time is not taken into account. Teacher effectiveness varies from one class to another and from one year to another based on a host of factors which are not measured. Using a test to establish teacher competency insures that teachers will teach to the test.

The percentage of test questions which deal with higher order learning is about three percent. While standardized tests may establish district-wide student improvement on lower-order skills, they will be insensitive to higher-order learning. Since excellence requires mastery of higher order skills, the use of a standardized instrument to reward an individual teacher for excellence is unlikely to succeed because it will not measure higher order skills in students. Teachers are advised to establish the professional utility of proposals before accepting an evaluation mechanism for a Phase III plan or any of its components.

10. Evaluation of Teachers in Phase III Plans.

Evaluation of teachers occurs in connection with performance-based pay plans and plans which combine performance-based pay and supplemental pay.

9.1 "Pure" Performance-based Plans.

Three districts submitted plans containing performance-based components only. These recognized and rewarded teachers for performance; increased student achievement; professional growth and contributions. They also provided a variety of options for receiving performance-based pay; eligibility for all teachers to participate; and specific criteria for eligibility. Two plans provided for "points" to qualify for additional compensation. One creates a "core" category and an "academic" category. The "core" category includes identification of curriculum needs with planned implementation; successful teacher evaluation by administrators; additional training in the teacher's field; a bonus point provision for completed course work in an approved master's degree program; and limited use of sick leave and personal leave. The "academic" category allows "points" for committee work; tutoring; in-service; mentoring other teachers; field trips; and the preparation of student academic contests.

The other "point" plan has four areas -- teacher evaluation, student performance, attainment of group and individual goals, and professional growth and contribution. Points are assigned only in the "professional growth and contribution" area -- for serving on professional committees, professional contributions, school community relations, curriculum development, and involvement in student-centered activities.

The remaining plan requires high achievement of students; excellence in cooperation, rapport and communication with students, colleagues, administrators and patrons; and involvement in activities for improving the profession of education and demonstrating commitment.

9.2 Composite Plans.

Many components in the three "pure" plans appear in the fifty-three plans which combine performance-based pay and supplemental pay. The most popular activities for earning supplemental pay are curricular development (89%); staff development meetings and conferences (70%); college credit for content (60%); performance-based pay study (45%); summer school (34%); extended day classes and activities (34%); tutoring (23%); and instruction for certification (23%). Performance-based pay is linked with individual teacher's goals in twenty-four districts; performance evaluation in twenty districts; peer review in ten districts; career ladder in nine districts; building-level goals in nine districts; individual activities in six districts; and student achievement in three districts. Plans submitted by these districts identify at least two of the above components in their plans.

Twelve AEA's submitted pay plans which were supplemental only, and three submitted combination plans. Supplemental plans included curricular development (11 AEA's); study of performance-based pay (10); meetings and conferences (8); credit for certification (7); credit of content area (6); locally developed staff development (4); additional teaching and other extended day activities (4); college credit (2); and summer school (1). The combination plans all include curriculum development, study of performance-based pay, and locally developed staff development.

11. Recommendation for Evaluation in Phase III.

In studying performance-based pay plans which involve teacher evaluation, teachers should:

* Encourage a district to opt for comprehensive school transformation by presenting "collegial" evaluation as an alternative to "corporate" evaluation, provided that a district makes a commitment to comprehensive school transformation.
* Avoid checklists, particularly those in which criteria are not weighted for importance by teachers according to career level.
* Avoid "stand alone" evaluation or proposals which link evaluation to compensation only.
* Relate evaluation to professional autonomy, professional development and site-based decision-making as part of a systems approach to change whose goal is to transform schools from corporate to professional forms of organization.
* Insure that proposals are for the purpose of promoting normal career growth according to career level.

* Separate punitive (summative) evaluation from Phase III (formative) evaluation and provide that summative evaluation occurs without reference to Phase III evaluation.

* Avoid linking performance-based pay to narrow measures of student achievement, such as standardized test scores.

* Limit peer assessment to formative assistance by tenured teachers to probationary teachers.

* Avoid peer evaluation when both the evaluator and evaluated work for the same district.

* Note that peer evaluation will be unlawful for unendorsed teachers in 1990.

* Insure that all evaluations, including denials of performance-based pay, are grievable under master negotiated agreements.

* Base performance-based pay on the achievement of group goals rather than individual goals.

* If individual evaluation is used as a basis for performance-based pay, use evaluation criteria and procedures which are valid, reliable, practical and professional.

* Determine "rewards" and all other mandatory subjects, such as evaluation, at the bargaining table.

* Insure that all questionnaires to teachers about mandatory subjects, such as evaluation, are issued and collated by your bargaining unit only.

* Maintain contact with the ISEA's professional staff throughout the local development or study cycle.

Specifically, teachers should develop language to implement evaluation systems which provide that:

1. Formative and summative evaluation are in separate systems to fully achieve their separate and conflicting purposes.

2. Data collected in the formative process is confidential and available only to the evaluator and teacher.

3. Teachers will not function as evaluators in summative evaluation.

4. Once a teacher achieves tenure, summative is on a de novo basis, only used in instances where inadequacy is perceived. In those instances, an outside team of evaluators must be used.

5. The instructional improvement system moves beyond adequacy to excellence through a systems approach where assessment is but one interactive part.

6. Both systems require frequent, ongoing training of administrators and teachers.

7. Manipulation of a reward-punishment system does not drive an instructional improvement system.

As a general matter, teachers should work toward systems which:

1. Define "summative" as "potentially punitive," where deficiency is presumed; "formative" as "nonpunitive" where adequacy within the parameters of normal career growth is presumed.

2. Separate formative and summative evaluation into distinct procedures which do not overlap.

3. Insure confidentiality of formative evaluation data.

4. Involve teachers in formative evaluation, but not summative evaluation, provided formative evaluation is not linked to summative evaluation.

5. Create outside evaluating teams as fact-finders in cases of alleged deficiency of tenured teachers.

6. Establish de novo review by outside evaluating teams.

7. View evaluation as one element in a comprehensive effort to transform schools into collegial environments.

8. Delegate summative responsibility to central administration and formative to principals.

In studying evaluation, teachers should know:

1. There are multiple purposes for evaluation.

2. Even legitimate purposes may be in conflict with one another.

3. Criteria for one purpose may not be valid for another.

4. Use of "promise of reward" or "threat of punishment" has no place in a system with "improvement" as its purpose.

5. The ranking of teachers into classifications has little value in such a system, and may have specific, negative effects, if used.

6. "Improvement" implies a deliberate program utilizing higher-order teaching skills or individual instruction.

7. "Improvement" means achieving normal career growth to career-level specific stages of effectiveness and excellence.